REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. No claim amendments have been made herein.

Claims 1-19 are rejected. Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165815 to Vincent ("Vincent"). Claims 3-5, 8, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vincent.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vincent.

Vincent does not disclose "wherein the first submission is directed to a second party and includes an identifier associated with the first submission," as recited in claim 1. Vincent recites that "preferred embodiments of the present invention utilize techniques such as those described below to maintain the anonymity of the purchaser 302 posting the statement of interest 310." Para. [0035]. But Vincent does not disclose "including an identifier associated with the first submission."

Vincent does not disclose "receiving a response to the first submission from the second party" and "sending a notification to the first party, wherein the notification provides information for securely accessing the response," as recited in claim 1. First, Vincent does not disclose receiving the second party's response to the first party and sending a notification to the first party. The Examiner asserts that Vincent discloses receiving a response. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites to paragraph [0071] of Vincent, which recites:

> The embodiments of the scalable network framework described above require some mechanism for identifying individual messages. In preferred embodiments, every message (i.e., resource request or response) is assigned a unique identification number. For example, one embodiment employs an algorithm developed by Microsoft Corporation that allows each user node to individually generate globally-unique message identifiers (GUIDs) that are very likely to be globally unique. Additionally, each user node must store (e.g., in a table) at least a limited history of forwarded messages in order to allow responses to reach the user node that sent a message through the same path. Further, some embodiments include a mechanism to prevent the looping of a resource request. For example, the globally-unique message identifiers GUIDs and node history tables can easily be used to create an anti-looping mechanism.

However, Vincent's discussion of creating message identifiers is not germane to sending a notification to the first party. Vincent recites that "A seller responds to the statement of interest by providing information 312 about that seller's goods or service that relate to the goods or service specified in the statement of interest 310." *See* Para. [0036]. Further, "[a]fter receiving one or more responses containing information 312, the purchaser 302 issues a formal request for bid 314 to the sellers 304 via the electronic network (either to all of the sellers or only to those sellers that submitted information 312 to the purchaser)." Para. [0037]. So Vincent recites a method where a response from the seller is sent directly to the purchase for the purchaser's review. In contrast, claim 1 recites that a notification is sent to the first party, who must submit a second submission in order to become authenticated to review the response of the second party. In order to do so, the notification is sent to the first party. Because Vincent does not require that a notification is sent to the purchaser before allowing the purchaser to view the message from the seller, Vincent does not disclose "sending a notification to the first party."

Second, Vincent does not provide information for securely accessing the response from the second party. The Examiner, again, recites paragraph [0071] as the basis for Vincent's disclosure. However, Vincent fails to disclose providing "information for securely accessing the response." Merely including a message identifier does not allow a secure access to the seller's response. Indeed, Vincent fails to recite anywhere that the purchaser must be authenticated to securely access the response of the seller.

Therefore, Vincent fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Because claim 1 is believed to be allowable, claims 2, 6-7, and 9-14 are also believed to be allowable as they depend on claim 1. Accordingly, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7, and 9-14.

Rejection of Claims 3-5, 8, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-5, 8, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vincent. This rejection is respectfully traversed. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Vincent does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 3-5, 8, and 15-19 because Vincent fails to disclose each and every element of independent claim 1. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-5, 8, and 15-19.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filling of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 110980.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____*May 1, 2009*_____   By: _*/Eric L. Sophir, Reg. No. 48,499/*_
KING & SPALDING LLP   Eric L. Sophir
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW   Registration No. 48,499
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-8980